It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On May 21, 1929, the Oscar Lucks Co., Seattle, Wash., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel and paid the costs of the proceedings, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant for reconditioning under the supervision of this department, upon deposit of collateral security in the sum of \$250 to insure compliance with the law.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Secretary of Agriculture.

16458. Adulteration of walnut ments. U. S. v. 22 Cases of Walnut Meats. Decree of condemnation entered. Product released upon deposit of collateral. (F. & D. No. 23771. I. S. No. 07800. S. No. 1958.)

On May 18, 1929, the United States attorney for the Western District of Washington, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 22 cases of walnut meats, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Seattle, Wash., alleging that the article had been shipped by the California Walnut Growers Association, from Los Angeles, Calif., and transported from the State of California into the State of Washington, arriving at Seattle on or about December 4, 1928, and charging adulteration in violation of the food and drugs act.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On May 21, 1929, the Oscar Lucks Co., Seattle, Wash., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel and paid the costs of the proceedings, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant for reconditioning under the supervision of this department, upon deposit of collateral security in the sum of \$250 to insure compliance with the law.

ARTHUR M. HYDE, Secretary of Agriculture.

16459. Misbranding of butter. U. S. v. 25 Cases of Butter, et al. Decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 23805. I. S. Nos. 07580, 07581, 07582, 07583. S. No. 1850.)

On March 12, 1929, the United States attorney for the Western District of Louisiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 44 cases of butter, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Shreveport, La., alleging that the article had been shipped by the Fort Smith Creamery Co., from Fort Smith, Ark., in various lots on February 6, February 25, March 4, and March 6, 1929, respectively, and transported from the State of Arkansas into the State of Louisiana, and charging misbranding in violation of the food and drugs act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Retail carton) "1 Lb. Net Weight."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statement "1 Lb. Net Weight," borne on the packages containing the said article, was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was in package form and the quantity of the contents of each carton was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside thereof, since the quantity of food contained therein was less than the quantity labeled and represented on the said carton

less than the quantity labeled and represented on the said carton.

On or about March 14, 1929, the Fort Smith Creamery Co., Fort Smith, Ark., having appeared as claimant for the property and having admitted the allegations of the libel, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be released to the said claimant upon payment of costs and the execution of a bond in the sum of \$500, conditioned in part that it be reshipped to the claimant at Fort Smith, Ark., and removed from the deceptive cartons and repacked in compliance with the requirements of the Federal food and drugs act under the supervision of this department.